

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6 and 7, as amended, remain herein. Claims 2-5 have been cancelled. Support for the amended claims can be found throughout applicant's original disclosure, including, for example, in applicant's specification at paragraph 54.

1. The amendments herein moot the objections to the claims.
2. The amendments herein moot the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.
3. Claims 1, 3 and 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Ohara U.S. Patent 6,775,908. Claims 3 and 5 have been cancelled, mooting the rejections thereof. Claims 1 and 7, as amended, recite the cam lobe composition, and subjecting an inner circumferential surface of the cam lobe to treatment for residual compressive stress addition treatment, the residual compressive stress on the inner circumferential surface of the cam lobe being not less than 100 MPa. The Office Action, pages 3 and 4, alleges that Ohara, column 10, lines 25-36, discloses "subjecting the inner section of the cam lobe piece to carburizing hardening," but points to no section of Ohara disclosing the residual compressive stress on the inner circumferential surface of the cam lobe being not less than 100 MPa. Nor does Ohara disclose such limitations.

Claims 1 and 7, as amended, also recite subjecting an outer peripheral surface of the cam lobe to treatment for residual compressive stress addition treatment, the residual compressive stress on the outer peripheral surface of the cam lobe being not less than 100 MPa. The Office Action, page 4, alleges that Ohara, column 10, lines 25-38, discloses that the "outer peripheral surface of the cam lobe is also subjected to treatment for residual compressive stress addition

treatment prior to joining the cam lobe to the camshaft,” but points to no section of Ohara disclosing the residual compressive stress on the outer circumferential surface of the cam lobe being not less than 100 MPa. Nor does Ohara disclose such limitations.

Claims 1 and 7, as amended, also recite that the treatment for residual compressive stress addition treatment comprises a treatment selected from the group consisting of shot-peening, barrel polishing, and carbonitriding. Ohara discloses none of the aforementioned treatments.

Claims 6 is dependent upon claim 1, which is distinguished above herein, mooting the rejection thereof.

Since Ohara fails to disclose every element of applicant’s claims 1 and 7, Ohara is an inadequate basis for rejecting claims 1, 3 and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

4. Claims 2 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ohara in view of Barth U.S. Patent 6,438,836. Claims 2 and 4 have been canceled, mooting the rejections thereof.

Accordingly, all claims 1, 6 and 7 are now fully in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. The PTO is hereby authorized to charge/credit any fee deficiencies or overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-4293. If further amendments would place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is invited to call applicant's undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP



Roger W. Parkhurst
Reg. No. 25,177
William J. Barrow
Reg. No. 62,813

Date: February 24, 2010

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
1330 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-1795
Tel: (202) 429-3000
Fax: (202) 429-3902

Attorney Docket No. 28984.0051